SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF A SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT ISSUED BY KING COUNTY TO BAYVIEW ON THE LAKE CONDOMINIUM 5 . HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION, EAST LAKE WASHINGTON AUDUBON SOCIETY, Appellant, SHB No. 82-31 ٧. FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, 9 : CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND KING COUNTY and BAYVIEW ON ORDER 10 ! THE LAKE CONDOMINIUM HOMEOWNERS! ASSOCIATION, 11 Respondents. 12 This matter, a request for review of a shoreline substantial 13 development permit for construction of a 20-slip moorage facility came 14 15 1 on for hearing before the Shorelines Hearings Board, Gayle Rothrock, 16 Chairman, David Akana, Larry Faulk, A. M. O'Meara, Nancy Burnett, and Dennis Derickson, Members, convened at Lacey, Washington, on 17 : January 13, 1983. William A. Harrison, Administrative Law Judge, 18

BEFORE THE

5 F No 3928-05-67

1 i

1	C	Ţ	es	1	₫	ed	

2 : Appellant appeared by its president, Leonard Steiner. Respondent

3 : King County did not appear. Respondent Bayview appeared by its

attorney, James S. Fitzgerald. Reporter Bibi Carter recorded the

proceedings. 5,

6 1

9 1

15

17

18

20

12

23 .

26

27

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were examined. From testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Shorelines Hearings Board makes these 8 1

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

10 .

11 ! Bayview on the Lake (Bayview) is an existing 40-unit condominium 12 ' development in Juanita, King County. It is on the shoreline of Juanita Bay of Lake Washington. 13 .

14 ΙI

West of the Bayview site and adjacent to it is King County Juanita Beach Park. The swimming area of the Park is enclosed by a concrete 16 pile pier which is "U" shaped and extends some 1,330 feet into Juanita Bay.

19 · III

> East of the Bayview site and adjacent to it is the 44-unit Juanita Shores Condominium which is now under construction and also fronts along Juanita Bay. 1

Juanita Shores Condominium was the object of an earlier decision 24 of the Board, Juanita Condo, Homeowners Assoc. v. King County, SHB Nos. 78-20 and 78-22 (1979). Aff'd King County Superior Court No.  $^{25}$ 862511.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER SHB No. 82-31

٧

1 1

Upland of the site are a recently constructed three-story office building, a supermarket, and a fast-food restaurant.

ŧ

5 Bayview proposes to construct a timber pier, associated finger 6 piers, and breakwater for up to 20 moorage spaces for use by owners of 7 the condominium units. The pier would be 120 feet in length and 8 accommodate recreational boats. The proposed moorage facilities will 9 , be extensions on an existing 80-foot guest dock.

10 VI

Bayview applied to King County for a shoreline substantial 11 13 development permit on September 18, 1980. A Final Environmental 10 Impact Statement was issued in March, 1982. On July 30, 1982, King 14 County approved a substantial development permit with 22 conditions. These conditions promibit covered moorage, major repairing of boats, 15 16 ' boat launching as well as require a portable sewage pump-out unit and 17 oil containment boom, among other things. Also prohibited by permit 1S condition is any excavation or dredging below the ordinary high water 19 line of the lake.

20 . VII

21 The proposed moorage would be constructed in an environment \_ \_ \_ designated "urban" by the King County Shoreline Master Program 20 (KCSNP). Moorage is a permitted use in the urban environment. KCSMP 24 Section 409(5), p. 18.

25

27

2

3 |

1	VIII
2	Juanita Bay is used for boating, swimming, sailing, waterskiing,
3	and fishing. It is also habitat for an estimated daily average of
4	1,000 waterfowl during the winter.
5	·
6	The proposed moorage is approximately 550 feer west of the Juanita
7	Bay wetlands. Those wetlands are designated "conservancy" by the
8	KCSMP and partially designated as "sensitive area" under King County
9 -	' Sensitive Areas Ordinance No. 4365. The wetlands provide habitat for
10	a variety of shore birds, waterfowl, and small mammals.
11	, x
12 ;	Appellant has not shown that the proposed moorage will result in
13	any significant reduction in the use of the area by waterfowl or othe
14	wildlife.
15	xı
16	Appellant has not shown that the proposed moorage will result in
17	any significant disturbance to the Juanita Bay wetlands.
18	XII
19	Authorization of this proposal does not imply automatic approval
20	by governmental agencies of other requests for moorage in the area.
21	XIII
22	any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is
23	hereby adopted as such.
54	From these Findings of Fact come these
25	
26	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER
27	SHB NO. 82-31 4

1,	1	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
2	1	I
3	1	We review the proposed development for consistency with the
4	[ }	Shoreline Management Act and the KCSMP which is the applicable
5	ŀ	shoreline master program. RCW 90.58.140(2)(a). We also review the
6	ı	action of local government for consistency with the State
7	:	Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW.
8	,	II
9	1	Appellant has not proven that the substantial development permit
10	+	granted by King County authorizes development which is inconsistent
11	1 1	with the Shoreline Management Act, the KCSMP or SEPA.
12	,	III
p -	ı	Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is
14	;	rereby adopted as such.
15		From these Conclusions of Law the Board enters this
16	į	
17	ļ 	
15		
19	;	
20	ı	
21	† †	
33	í	
23		
24		
25		

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER
SHB No. 82-31

. .....

1 .	ORDER
2	The shoreline substantial development permit granted by King
3	County to Bayview on the Lake Condominium Homeowners' Association is
4	affirmed.
5	DONE this 3 day of - 1-12/16/21, 1983.
6	SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD
7 · 8 ·	Saule Rothrock
9	GAYLE ROTHROCK, Chairman
10	¬ .0 .0
11	David Alema DAVID AKANA, Lawyer Member
12	
13	andull
14	LAJIRENCE J. FAULK, Member
15 16	A. M. O'MEARA, Member
17	A. M. O MERKA, Member
18	Mancy Downett
19	NANCY BURNETT, Member
20	Maria Pharban
21	DENNIS DERICKSON, Member
20	$9.)in \cdot 0 \neq 0$
23	William A. HARRISON
24	Administrative Law Judge
25	
26 27	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER SHB No. 82-31 6